

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed on September 10, 2009, claims 1-3, 5, 9, 13, and 17-23 are allowed. Additionally, claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, and 15 are objected to because of informalities and would be allowable if amended to overcome the objections. Furthermore, the specification is objected to. In response, claims 3, 4, 6, 10, and 14 have been amended. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Objections to the Specification

Regarding the Office Action's suggestion to add section headings, Applicant respectfully declines because the indicated suggestions in 37 C.F.R. § 1.77(b) are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC § 111(a), but per 37 C.F.R. § 1.51(b) are only guidelines that are suggested for Applicant's use.

Claim Objections

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, and 15 are objected to. In particular, the Office Action states that the limitation "said synchronization field" in claim 4 is unclear. In response, claim 4 has been amended to be directly dependent on claim 1. Support for the amendment to claim 4 is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, original claims 1-4, Fig. 3, page 3, lines 24-27, 33, and 34, page 5, lines 3-6, and page 9, lines 3-11. Applicant respectfully submits that the limitation "said synchronization field" in amended claim 4 is clear. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claim 3 has been amended to be directly dependent on claim 1. Additionally, claim 3 has been amended to replace the phrase "said short frame format has a synchronization field comprising a first predetermined number of consecutive bits of a first polarity or logic value" with the phrase "*said first frame format comprises a short frame format with a synchronization field having a first predetermined number of consecutive bits of a first polarity or logic value.*" Support for the amendments to claim 3 is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, original claims 1-4 and page 4, lines 26-34.

The Office Action also suggests replacing the phrase “the frame format decoder comprises” in claims 6 and 10 with the phrase “the frame format decoder *further* comprises.” Claims 6 and 10 have been amended as suggested. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 6 and 10 be withdrawn.

The Office Action also states that the limitation “an equalizer” in claim 14 has already been recited in claim 1. Claim 14 has been amended to replace the phrase “an equalizer” with the phrase “*the equalizer.*” Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 14 be withdrawn.

Additionally, the Office Action states that claims 7 and 15 are rejected for being dependent on objected claims 6 and 14, respectively. As described above, claims 6 and 14 have been amended to overcome claim objections. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 7 and 15 be withdrawn.

Because claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, and 15 were objected to because of informalities and have been amended herein to overcome the objections, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, and 15 are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: September 24, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111